

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss this case with Applicant's Attorney on June 13, 2003 and again on June 17, 2003.¹

The Final Office Action, dated April 10, 2003, considered claims 1-25 and rejected claims 1-2, 4-20, 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Applicant's purported Prior Art Admission (Fig. 1, pages 2-4) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,745, issued to Wiederhold (hereinafter Wiederhold). Claims 3-4 and 21 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the purported Prior Art Admission in view of Wiederhold and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,893,128, issued to Nauckhoff, (hereinafter Nauckhoff).

By this paper, independent claims 1, 17, 19 and 24 have been amended by this paper. Accordingly, claims 1-25 now remain pending, of which only claims 1, 17, 19, and 25 comprise independent claims.

As previously discussed with the Examiner, and as stated in the previous amendment, the claimed methods of the invention are directed to allowing client applications to control how high-level document commands are implemented in database management systems. The recited methods comprise various acts, including: an act of receiving a high-level document command, the act of identifying and the act of notifying one or more client applications of the receipt of the high-level document command, prior to implementing the high-level document command, and the acts of receiving and following instructions from the one or more client applications on how to affect the implementation of the high-level document command.

Applicants respectfully submit that these claimed methods are neither anticipated by nor made obvious by the art of record, either singly or in combination.

Initially, Applicant's respectfully submit that the purported Prior Art Admission found on page 3, lines 17-24, page 4, lines 1-10 and Figure 1, does not disclose, suggest or otherwise anticipate or make obvious "a method for allowing client applications to control how a particular high-level document command is implemented," as suggested on Page 3 of the Final Office Action. To the contrary, in lines 3-5 of page 4, it is stated that "**Once** the high-level document command is **implemented**, the database management system may notify other client applications

¹ During the telephone discussions, Applicant's Attorney inquired about the Examiner's reference to the term "client applications" and what the Examiner considered to be analogous to "client applications" as taught by Weiderhold. The Examiner stated that the "client applications" in Weiderhold included both the Weiderhold "security officer" and "mediator", even though Applicant's Attorney pointed out that the security officer in Weiderhold is a human being.

using notification module 150 that the high-level document command was implemented.” (emphasis added). Thereafter, “the other client applications...can update [their] local database to reflect the change...” (page 4, ll. 6-10). Accordingly, the Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art merely points out how, in the conventional methods, notification is “only dispatched after the high-level document command is implemented. ... [and that] [t]here is nothing the client application can do to affect how the high-level document command is implemented... or [even] whether the high-level document command is to be implemented at all.” (page 4, ll. 11-15).

The Weiderhold reference also fails to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. In particular, Weiderhold fails to disclose or suggest the claim elements recited in the claims. For example, Weiderhold fails to teach ‘an act of identifying one or more client applications that are to be notified of the receipt of a high-level document command’, an ‘act of notifying the one or more identified client applications that the high-level document command has been received’, and the acts of ‘receiving and following instructions from the one or more client applications on how to affect the implementation of the high-level document command.’

In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to various passages (col. 3, ll. 20-45 and 50-60; col. 4, ll. 55-65; col. 5, ll. 1-5; and col. 7, ll. 1-20) that purportedly teach the recited claim elements discussed above. However, these passages are directed to teachings of “security mediators” and a “human security officer.” Although the Examiner has stated that the security officer and the security mediators both comprise the client applications,² Applicant respectfully disagrees. In fact, neither of the security mediator and human officer should be considered analogous to the client applications, as recited in the claims, for at least the following reasons.

In particular, the “security mediators are computing modules...interposed in the information flow among collaborating enterprises...[that] define the release policies for enterprise information.” (col. 3, ll. 38-43). It is the security mediator that determines whether a request meets certain criteria and thereafter allows the request to proceed if it satisfies certain rules. If a request is determined by the security mediator to not satisfy the rules (thereby meeting certain criteria), then it is passed on to the human security officer who ultimately determines whether the request should still be allowed to proceed or if it should be edited or rejected.

² This was clarified by the Examiner during telephone conversations held on Tuesday, June 17, 2003 with Applicant’s Attorney.

The security mediator should not be considered analogous to the client applications of the pending claims because the security mediator does not receive only the high-level commands that are determined to meet certain criteria. Rather, the security mediator is interposed between the collaborating enterprises in such a manner as to intercept the queries and results passing therethrough to determine whether they meet certain criteria by assessing “the legitimacy of queries and results respectively”, and thereby “safeguarding the privacy of the data of the collaborating enterprises. (col. 4, ll. 57-62 and col. 3, ll. 43-44.) Thereafter, it is a human security officer that ultimately determines whether requests can be granted. (col. 5, ll. 4-5).

The “human security officer,” however, should also not be considered analogous with the client applications. Initially, the human security officer is a human being, not a computer application. The human influence of the security officer is necessary, according to Weiderhold, because “automation can never resolve all questions of access.” Accordingly, the security officer, which is human, “is advised when the rules indicate a possible violation.” (col. 3, ll. 55-57). Thereafter, it is the human security officer who ultimately approves edits or rejects the queries and results comprising rule violations. Col. 5, ll. 1-10.

Even though the independent claims have been amended herein to more clearly reflect that the client applications receive notification of *only* the high-level commands meeting certain criteria, Applicant’s respectfully request entry of this amendment After Final inasmuch as it places the claims in condition for allowance without raising new issues. In particular, the claim amendments should not be considered as raising new issues because the recited methods already stated that the act of notifying the client applications corresponded to the receipt of a “high-level document command meeting certain criteria”. Accordingly, the claims have merely been amended to improve clarity, by adding redundancy, to more clearly recite the claimed embodiments.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant’s respectfully submit that the amended independent claims 1, 17, 19 and 25 should be allowed over the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims should also be allowed for at least the same reasons.³

³ This includes dependent claims 3-4 and 21 which were rejected in view of Nauckoff in combination with the other cited references. The Nauckoff reference was only cited by the Examiner for the proposition that high-level document commands can be implemented atomically, and was not used to reject any of the independent claims. Accordingly, dependent claims 3-4 and 21 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regard to independent claims 1 and 19. Inasmuch as Nauckoff was not used to reject any of the independent claims, it will not be addressed any further at this time.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8th day of July 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorneys for Applicants



022913

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

W:\13768\173\CM0000002971V001.doc